

THE BAPTIST RECORD

REPLY TO BRO. JACKSON.

DEAR BRO. JACKSON:—I am thankful that your heart has been touched by my needy condition, and your endeavor to "get one ray of light to penetrate" my "benighted" mind, though perhaps fruitless, was kind. But you have assigned another reason for replying to my article, which (and its author also I suppose) was unworthy of notice, and which could have no weight with the "intelligent and scripturally informed" readers of THE RECORD. You feared some "untaught," ignorant person might be infected by the hidden poison in my words.

Here comes in a singular coincidence. I wrote for precisely the same class that causes you such anxiety. I was not afraid that any "intelligent and scripturally informed" Baptist—especially if a RECORD reader, for THE RECORD is an additional safeguard—would be misled by the teaching of your preachers. But your denomination is making an aggressive warfare in this State, and while I console myself with the thought that Baptists seldom lose any timber that is worth having, still there are some "untaught," ignorant ones, babes in Christ, for whom I must fight as well as pray. So my article was not one of offense, but defense. I endeavored to defend and warn the "untaught," the novice both within and without the pale of my denomination. I expected a reply from Bro. W. A. Crum, the noted defender of the faith (never delivered to the saints, for whose zeal your State paper occasionally apologizes). But for some reason he has not delivered a reply, and I rejoice that my adversary is one of whom I have heard so much that is favorable as yourself. From what I know of you by reputation, as a meek and lowly Christian, I honor you, and as a brother in Christ you have my fraternal regards. So let us shake hands before we cross swords. I did not, and do not now, desire a controversy, and shall not endeavor to prolong it, though always ready to meet an attack. I assure you I shall not indulge in personalities, as I consider a resort to such weapons unworthy of one who claims to be born from above. I shall try to write in the spirit of my Master, and pray that no words of mine may wound a brother for whom Christ died.

If my reply seem unsatisfactory, let this be my excuse: I am too busy to exercise the caution of a revision, and so the first copy is the last. But the case with the article you assailed. If I seem to miss or evade any point, it is because in my haste it is overlooked. Should I be guilty of any apparent evasion, I would esteem it a favor if you would call my attention to it. You think me too ignorant to "set myself up" as a "writer for the public print." I admit I am not blessed with a college education, and have never had but fifteen months schooling in my life. What little knowledge I possess has been acquired by home reading and thinking. I endeavor to assimilate and absorb by meditation. The Bible I have read more than any book, and its pages never tire. The only books of a theological nature I have ever read are Christian's "Immersion" (one or two books in favor of baby sprinkling, and some books by Campbell, Ennet, Challen and other writers of your denomination. The only Baptist book I have ever read is your ultimate authority, the book from which all my theology is derived, the book that made a Baptist of me—the Bible. If I am admittedly so ignorant, why do I write? Because I believe in my soul that I am called of God to preach and defend His gospel, not only in the pulpit, but through the press and other lawful agencies. I write, and pray God to bless my work, and leave results with Him. You think me benighted. If so, pray for me, brother, and I shall continue to pray, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of this law."

But I must come to the point, or my creed will prove too lengthy for insertion. Allow me to say you have not met the issue I raised. I wished to know if the quotations from Prof. Lollars and Dr. Fagin did not teach baptismal regeneration; what they did teach? You have not answered this question, but simply endeavor (in vain, however), to prove that baptism is "the act on man's part that culminates in his salvation or pardon." I will pass by your illustrations, which do not illustrate, for you seem so conscious of the fact that they do not apply to the question in dispute that you anxiously inquire, "See the point?" As to the difference between the "Romish doctrine" of baptismal regeneration, and the teaching that baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins, little need be said by me, for Bro. Hackett has got in ahead of me, and in an excellent little paragraph says more than I could say in four columns. I have never said that the disciples taught that there was any saving efficacy in the water itself. I know very well that you claim that it is through the "obedience

of faith" that a man's sins are remitted in the act of baptism. My language in my former article—"the water, by absorption, reaches and cleanses the soul," must not be taken seriously—it was a rhetorical absurdity. I have never heard it claimed by any one that the water itself purified the soul, but all who teach this dogma of baptismal regeneration claim that, by virtue of God's appointment, or by virtue of the candidate's obedience, the sins are washed away in baptism. Your disposition is without a difference. If you teach that we are pardoned when baptized and not when we exercise faith, you magnify baptism, and consequently good works above faith, and undoubtedly teach baptismal regeneration, which you rightly call Romish doctrine.

If a man's sins are not forgiven until he is baptized, he is until then in an unsaved condition, and if he dies unbaptized, dies unsaved. Thus you make baptism essential to salvation, and make the "want of God, called to preach the word and baptize believers, more powerful than his Creator, in that he will not save a man who is not baptized." I will not endeavor to prove exhaustively that salvation is predicated of faith only, for I do not consider that I am called upon to do so, and were I so inclined, I would use more space than Bro. Hackett can spare me. However, I will touch briefly upon this subject. Paul repeatedly tells us that we are justified by faith without the works of the law. This faith, by which man attains unto salvation, is a comprehensive thing, for in it lies buried the germs of a new life, and consequently of new truths. God sees a man in his sinful and unsaved condition. His all-compassionate heart caused Him to give up His well-beloved Son to die, and the blood of the Lamb was freely shed for the salvation of the world. The spirit applies the gospel of truth to the heart of the sinner, and he awakens to a realization of his lost condition. What must he do? As he reflects upon his iniquity and the goodness of God, it leads him to repentance.

But repentance is not enough. Repentance consists of three elements: 1. A grievous consciousness of sin. 2. A Godly sorrow for sin. 3. A determined turning from sin. Repentance, then, evidently cannot save a sinner, for a knowledge of sin cannot begot holiness, a sorrow for sin cannot wash away its stain, and a turning from sin cannot make a new life, it cannot give the soul a love for good because it is good, nor can it fill the soul with spiritual aspirations. Man may stop here, and stop short of salvation. But the next step is faith, and the sinner, when he takes this step, is immediately saved for time and eternity. Why? By reason of divine appointment, and because faith, like repentance, consists of three elements: that bring the sinner into that relationship to Christ, that the purifying blood is applied and the sins washed away. These three elements are: 1. Historical faith, or a belief on God and Christ as His Son and the Savior of sinners. 2. A confiding trust in Christ as a personal Savior. 3. A love for God as Father, and Christ as Savior, Master and King.

By this faith we lay hold on the promises of God, and when we first exercise it, the spirit of God makes new creatures of us. We are born again, begotten of God, regenerated. This agrees with the scriptures, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Baptism comes under the head of works. Could we save ourselves by baptism or works of any other nature, we could not lean on Christ for all, and would not have the humble spirit that should characterize all the followers of the meek and lowly Savior, but we would boast, "We saved ourselves."

"But baptism is a duty. It is commanded of us. Can ye be saved and disobey?" I maintain that if we were truly saved, we will endeavor and strive to obey all the commands of God, and it will be a source of joy to the soul to do so. Good works (including baptism) are the fruit and not the procuring cause of salvation.

"But, you say, 'we are commanded to be baptized for (in order to) the remission of sins?'" Well, yes, the Bible says, and I preach, and shall always continue to preach, that we should be baptized for (because of) the remission of sins. This little word: for is used in many ways. Worcester defines it, "because of, by reason of," among other definitions. So some of your brethren who have asserted that the word was never so used, will please remember this, they said, calling on the name of the Lord." True, Worcester also defines it, "in order to," as you understand it to mean in this instance, but when in the light of the whole Bible, it is so plain that salvation or the remission of sins follows faith, it is singular you should prefer to understand the word for, to mean in order to, in direct contradiction to this teaching; when by accepting the natural interpretation, because of, it agrees perfectly with all the rest of the scripture on this subject. Worcester also defines the word for, "in the place of," instead of, "for the sake of," "in place of," baptism for (in the place of) remission of sins? The word for is also defined, "With respect to; with regard to; relating to; concerning." "For the sake of," "on account of." "Noting purpose, tendency or destination; proceeding or tending to; towards." "Conducive to; beneficial to." "According to; in spite of." How would this do in connection with baptism for the remission of sins? "According to the remission of sins," or "in spite of the remission of sins."

Now, seeing that the word for has many meanings, according to the context and the place in the sentence, what do you, in this instance, restrict the meaning of the word to in order to? You will say that the rest of the scripture supports this interpretation. Very well, so you honestly think, and as a member of this denomination which stands pre-eminently for freedom of conscience, I shall make no objections to this; nor shall I make insinuations against your honesty because you see things in that light. Now, why can't you exercise the same charity? Why should you insist that we Baptists are setting scripture aside because we understand the word for in this instance to mean because of, believing this opinion to be supported by all the scripture teaching on the subject? If you believe for means in order to, because the rest of the scripture supports this view, if to us the scripture seems to support the definition, because of, is not that sufficient reason for us to accept that definition?

But Christ says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Yes, and He furthermore adds, "He that believeth not (disbelieveth—Revised Version) shall be damned." If a certain effect comes from a certain cause, the opposite effect must come from the opposite cause. If salvation is caused by one thing, damnation is caused by the opposite. A man's inability to be baptized does not cause his damnation, for Christ does not say, "He that is not baptized shall be damned," hence baptism does not cause his salvation or pardon. What is the cause of a man's damnation? Unbelief. What, then, is the cause of his salvation? Belief, or faith.

But Peter says, "Baptism doth also now save us." Yes, he says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us: not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the remission of sins, which is predicated only of a putting away of the filth of the flesh, through faith in Jesus' name; but the answer of a good conscience toward God." You did not quote the whole passage. It is easy to quote "Baptism doth also now save us" in support of that monstrous theological lie, baptismal regeneration, but when the whole passage is quoted, you see the meaning is very different from what the detached portion of scriptures seemed to teach.

In the Revised Version, this passage reads, "Wherein few that is, in Noah's day, that is, eight souls, were saved through water; which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (margin inquiry) of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1:20, 21, 22.

Baptism is here stated to be a figure of our salvation, and this is Baptist doctrine, because the New Testament doctrine. The Revised Version does not support your view.

After a true likeness, I accept, since it was a true likeness in this connection, let me tell you something that may surprise you. In the summer of 1882, I accepted as scriptural the doctrine preached by yourself, Bro. T. J. Waine, who of this fact, and told him on the first opportunity with the disciples. He would "take me on faith" Waine is now in Texas, and read these lines and call this statement. I had have since continued to literature, and am now and close reader of the Standard. But that infallible and book, the only authority of faith and practice, the creed, the word of God, which you advised me to study, change my theological views. The more I studied this more I became a Baptist, and it caused me a real pang of cherished doctrines. But to truth and conscience me to do so. As the have driven me from your position, I doubt that they will drive me back.

I shall not in the future, as I have never in the past, attempt to "cast a stigma upon Bible teaching." If from the scriptures you can prove your position to be founded on truth, I shall willingly lay aside my denominational spectacles and assume your own. In conclusion, I promise you respectful and prayerful consideration of whatever you may say in reply. Your brother in Christ, STUART H. B. MAYES, Yazoo City, Miss., May 12, 1893.

True, Worcester also defines it, "in order to," as you understand it to mean in this instance, but when in the light of the whole Bible, it is so plain that salvation or the remission of sins follows faith, it is singular you should prefer to understand the word for, to mean in order to, in direct contradiction to this teaching; when by accepting the natural interpretation, because of, it agrees perfectly with all the rest of the scripture on this subject. Worcester also defines the word for, "in the place of," instead of, "for the sake of," "in place of," baptism for (in the place of) remission of sins? The word for is also defined, "With respect to; with regard to; relating to; concerning." "For the sake of," "on account of." "Noting purpose, tendency or destination; proceeding or tending to; towards." "Conducive to; beneficial to." "According to; in spite of." How would this do in connection with baptism for the remission of sins? "According to the remission of sins," or "in spite of the remission of sins."

Now, seeing that the word for has many meanings, according to the context and the place in the sentence, what do you, in this instance, restrict the meaning of the word to in order to? You will say that the rest of the scripture supports this interpretation. Very well, so you honestly think, and as a member of this denomination which stands pre-eminently for freedom of conscience, I shall make no objections to this; nor shall I make insinuations against your honesty because you see things in that light. Now, why can't you exercise the same charity? Why should you insist that we Baptists are setting scripture aside because we understand the word for in this instance to mean because of, believing this opinion to be supported by all the scripture teaching on the subject? If you believe for means in order to, because the rest of the scripture supports this view, if to us the scripture seems to support the definition, because of, is not that sufficient reason for us to accept that definition?

But Christ says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Yes, and He furthermore adds, "He that believeth not (disbelieveth—Revised Version) shall be damned." If a certain effect comes from a certain cause, the opposite effect must come from the opposite cause. If salvation is caused by one thing, damnation is caused by the opposite. A man's inability to be baptized does not cause his damnation, for Christ does not say, "He that is not baptized shall be damned," hence baptism does not cause his salvation or pardon. What is the cause of a man's damnation? Unbelief. What, then, is the cause of his salvation? Belief, or faith.

DEAR BRO. JACKSON:—I am thankful that your heart has been touched by my needy condition, and your endeavor to "get one ray of light to penetrate" my "benighted" mind, though perhaps fruitless, was kind. But you have assigned another reason for replying to my article, which (and its author also I suppose) was unworthy of notice, and which could have no weight with the "intelligent and scripturally informed" readers of THE RECORD. You feared some "untaught," ignorant person might be infected by the hidden poison in my words.

Here comes in a singular coincidence. I wrote for precisely the same class that causes you such anxiety. I was not afraid that any "intelligent and scripturally informed" Baptist—especially if a RECORD reader, for THE RECORD is an additional safeguard—would be misled by the teaching of your preachers. But your denomination is making an aggressive warfare in this State, and while I console myself with the thought that Baptists seldom lose any timber that is worth having, still there are some "untaught," ignorant ones, babes in Christ, for whom I must fight as well as pray. So my article was not one of offense, but defense. I endeavored to defend and warn the "untaught," the novice both within and without the pale of my denomination. I expected a reply from Bro. W. A. Crum, the noted defender of the faith (never delivered to the saints, for whose zeal your State paper occasionally apologizes). But for some reason he has not delivered a reply, and I rejoice that my adversary is one of whom I have heard so much that is favorable as yourself. From what I know of you by reputation, as a meek and lowly Christian, I honor you, and as a brother in Christ you have my fraternal regards. So let us shake hands before we cross swords. I did not, and do not now, desire a controversy, and shall not endeavor to prolong it, though always ready to meet an attack. I assure you I shall not indulge in personalities, as I consider a resort to such weapons unworthy of one who claims to be born from above. I shall try to write in the spirit of my Master, and pray that no words of mine may wound a brother for whom Christ died.

If my reply seem unsatisfactory, let this be my excuse: I am too busy to exercise the caution of a revision, and so the first copy is the last. But the case with the article you assailed. If I seem to miss or evade any point, it is because in my haste it is overlooked. Should I be guilty of any apparent evasion, I would esteem it a favor if you would call my attention to it. You think me too ignorant to "set myself up" as a "writer for the public print." I admit I am not blessed with a college education, and have never had but fifteen months schooling in my life. What little knowledge I possess has been acquired by home reading and thinking. I endeavor to assimilate and absorb by meditation. The Bible I have read more than any book, and its pages never tire. The only books of a theological nature I have ever read are Christian's "Immersion" (one or two books in favor of baby sprinkling, and some books by Campbell, Ennet, Challen and other writers of your denomination. The only Baptist book I have ever read is your ultimate authority, the book from which all my theology is derived, the book that made a Baptist of me—the Bible. If I am admittedly so ignorant, why do I write? Because I believe in my soul that I am called of God to preach and defend His gospel, not only in the pulpit, but through the press and other lawful agencies. I write, and pray God to bless my work, and leave results with Him. You think me benighted. If so, pray for me, brother, and I shall continue to pray, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of this law."

But I must come to the point, or my creed will prove too lengthy for insertion. Allow me to say you have not met the issue I raised. I wished to know if the quotations from Prof. Lollars and Dr. Fagin did not teach baptismal regeneration; what they did teach? You have not answered this question, but simply endeavor (in vain, however), to prove that baptism is "the act on man's part that culminates in his salvation or pardon." I will pass by your illustrations, which do not illustrate, for you seem so conscious of the fact that they do not apply to the question in dispute that you anxiously inquire, "See the point?" As to the difference between the "Romish doctrine" of baptismal regeneration, and the teaching that baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins, little need be said by me, for Bro. Hackett has got in ahead of me, and in an excellent little paragraph says more than I could say in four columns. I have never said that the disciples taught that there was any saving efficacy in the water itself. I know very well that you claim that it is through the "obedience

of faith" that a man's sins are remitted in the act of baptism. My language in my former article—"the water, by absorption, reaches and cleanses the soul," must not be taken seriously—it was a rhetorical absurdity. I have never heard it claimed by any one that the water itself purified the soul, but all who teach this dogma of baptismal regeneration claim that, by virtue of God's appointment, or by virtue of the candidate's obedience, the sins are washed away in baptism. Your disposition is without a difference. If you teach that we are pardoned when baptized and not when we exercise faith, you magnify baptism, and consequently good works above faith, and undoubtedly teach baptismal regeneration, which you rightly call Romish doctrine.

If a man's sins are not forgiven until he is baptized, he is until then in an unsaved condition, and if he dies unbaptized, dies unsaved. Thus you make baptism essential to salvation, and make the "want of God, called to preach the word and baptize believers, more powerful than his Creator, in that he will not save a man who is not baptized." I will not endeavor to prove exhaustively that salvation is predicated of faith only, for I do not consider that I am called upon to do so, and were I so inclined, I would use more space than Bro. Hackett can spare me. However, I will touch briefly upon this subject. Paul repeatedly tells us that we are justified by faith without the works of the law. This faith, by which man attains unto salvation, is a comprehensive thing, for in it lies buried the germs of a new life, and consequently of new truths. God sees a man in his sinful and unsaved condition. His all-compassionate heart caused Him to give up His well-beloved Son to die, and the blood of the Lamb was freely shed for the salvation of the world. The spirit applies the gospel of truth to the heart of the sinner, and he awakens to a realization of his lost condition. What must he do? As he reflects upon his iniquity and the goodness of God, it leads him to repentance.

But repentance is not enough. Repentance consists of three elements: 1. A grievous consciousness of sin. 2. A Godly sorrow for sin. 3. A determined turning from sin. Repentance, then, evidently cannot save a sinner, for a knowledge of sin cannot begot holiness, a sorrow for sin cannot wash away its stain, and a turning from sin cannot make a new life, it cannot give the soul a love for good because it is good, nor can it fill the soul with spiritual aspirations. Man may stop here, and stop short of salvation. But the next step is faith, and the sinner, when he takes this step, is immediately saved for time and eternity. Why? By reason of divine appointment, and because faith, like repentance, consists of three elements: that bring the sinner into that relationship to Christ, that the purifying blood is applied and the sins washed away. These three elements are: 1. Historical faith, or a belief on God and Christ as His Son and the Savior of sinners. 2. A confiding trust in Christ as a personal Savior. 3. A love for God as Father, and Christ as Savior, Master and King.

By this faith we lay hold on the promises of God, and when we first exercise it, the spirit of God makes new creatures of us. We are born again, begotten of God, regenerated. This agrees with the scriptures, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Baptism comes under the head of works. Could we save ourselves by baptism or works of any other nature, we could not lean on Christ for all, and would not have the humble spirit that should characterize all the followers of the meek and lowly Savior, but we would boast, "We saved ourselves."

"But baptism is a duty. It is commanded of us. Can ye be saved and disobey?" I maintain that if we were truly saved, we will endeavor and strive to obey all the commands of God, and it will be a source of joy to the soul to do so. Good works (including baptism) are the fruit and not the procuring cause of salvation.

DEAR BRO. JACKSON:—I am thankful that your heart has been touched by my needy condition, and your endeavor to "get one ray of light to penetrate" my "benighted" mind, though perhaps fruitless, was kind. But you have assigned another reason for replying to my article, which (and its author also I suppose) was unworthy of notice, and which could have no weight with the "intelligent and scripturally informed" readers of THE RECORD. You feared some "untaught," ignorant person might be infected by the hidden poison in my words.

Here comes in a singular coincidence. I wrote for precisely the same class that causes you such anxiety. I was not afraid that any "intelligent and scripturally informed" Baptist—especially if a RECORD reader, for THE RECORD is an additional safeguard—would be misled by the teaching of your preachers. But your denomination is making an aggressive warfare in this State, and while I console myself with the thought that Baptists seldom lose any timber that is worth having, still there are some "untaught," ignorant ones, babes in Christ, for whom I must fight as well as pray. So my article was not one of offense, but defense. I endeavored to defend and warn the "untaught," the novice both within and without the pale of my denomination. I expected a reply from Bro. W. A. Crum, the noted defender of the faith (never delivered to the saints, for whose zeal your State paper occasionally apologizes). But for some reason he has not delivered a reply, and I rejoice that my adversary is one of whom I have heard so much that is favorable as yourself. From what I know of you by reputation, as a meek and lowly Christian, I honor you, and as a brother in Christ you have my fraternal regards. So let us shake hands before we cross swords. I did not, and do not now, desire a controversy, and shall not endeavor to prolong it, though always ready to meet an attack. I assure you I shall not indulge in personalities, as I consider a resort to such weapons unworthy of one who claims to be born from above. I shall try to write in the spirit of my Master, and pray that no words of mine may wound a brother for whom Christ died.

If my reply seem unsatisfactory, let this be my excuse: I am too busy to exercise the caution of a revision, and so the first copy is the last. But the case with the article you assailed. If I seem to miss or evade any point, it is because in my haste it is overlooked. Should I be guilty of any apparent evasion, I would esteem it a favor if you would call my attention to it. You think me too ignorant to "set myself up" as a "writer for the public print." I admit I am not blessed with a college education, and have never had but fifteen months schooling in my life. What little knowledge I possess has been acquired by home reading and thinking. I endeavor to assimilate and absorb by meditation. The Bible I have read more than any book, and its pages never tire. The only books of a theological nature I have ever read are Christian's "Immersion" (one or two books in favor of baby sprinkling, and some books by Campbell, Ennet, Challen and other writers of your denomination. The only Baptist book I have ever read is your ultimate authority, the book from which all my theology is derived, the book that made a Baptist of me—the Bible. If I am admittedly so ignorant, why do I write? Because I believe in my soul that I am called of God to preach and defend His gospel, not only in the pulpit, but through the press and other lawful agencies. I write, and pray God to bless my work, and leave results with Him. You think me benighted. If so, pray for me, brother, and I shall continue to pray, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of this law."

But I must come to the point, or my creed will prove too lengthy for insertion. Allow me to say you have not met the issue I raised. I wished to know if the quotations from Prof. Lollars and Dr. Fagin did not teach baptismal regeneration; what they did teach? You have not answered this question, but simply endeavor (in vain, however), to prove that baptism is "the act on man's part that culminates in his salvation or pardon." I will pass by your illustrations, which do not illustrate, for you seem so conscious of the fact that they do not apply to the question in dispute that you anxiously inquire, "See the point?" As to the difference between the "Romish doctrine" of baptismal regeneration, and the teaching that baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins, little need be said by me, for Bro. Hackett has got in ahead of me, and in an excellent little paragraph says more than I could say in four columns. I have never said that the disciples taught that there was any saving efficacy in the water itself. I know very well that you claim that it is through the "obedience

of faith" that a man's sins are remitted in the act of baptism. My language in my former article—"the water, by absorption, reaches and cleanses the soul," must not be taken seriously—it was a rhetorical absurdity. I have never heard it claimed by any one that the water itself purified the soul, but all who teach this dogma of baptismal regeneration claim that, by virtue of God's appointment, or by virtue of the candidate's obedience, the sins are washed away in baptism. Your disposition is without a difference. If you teach that we are pardoned when baptized and not when we exercise faith, you magnify baptism, and consequently good works above faith, and undoubtedly teach baptismal regeneration, which you rightly call Romish doctrine.

If a man's sins are not forgiven until he is baptized, he is until then in an unsaved condition, and if he dies unbaptized, dies unsaved. Thus you make baptism essential to salvation, and make the "want of God, called to preach the word and baptize believers, more powerful than his Creator, in that he will not save a man who is not baptized." I will not endeavor to prove exhaustively that salvation is predicated of faith only, for I do not consider that I am called upon to do so, and were I so inclined, I would use more space than Bro. Hackett can spare me. However, I will touch briefly upon this subject. Paul repeatedly tells us that we are justified by faith without the works of the law. This faith, by which man attains unto salvation, is a comprehensive thing, for in it lies buried the germs of a new life, and consequently of new truths. God sees a man in his sinful and unsaved condition. His all-compassionate heart caused Him to give up His well-beloved Son to die, and the blood of the Lamb was freely shed for the salvation of the world. The spirit applies the gospel of truth to the heart of the sinner, and he awakens to a realization of his lost condition. What must he do? As he reflects upon his iniquity and the goodness of God, it leads him to repentance.

But repentance is not enough. Repentance consists of three elements: 1. A grievous consciousness of sin. 2. A Godly sorrow for sin. 3. A determined turning from sin. Repentance, then, evidently cannot save a sinner, for a knowledge of sin cannot begot holiness, a sorrow for sin cannot wash away its stain, and a turning from sin cannot make a new life, it cannot give the soul a love for good because it is good, nor can it fill the soul with spiritual aspirations. Man may stop here, and stop short of salvation. But the next step is faith, and the sinner, when he takes this step, is immediately saved for time and eternity. Why? By reason of divine appointment, and because faith, like repentance, consists of three elements: that bring the sinner into that relationship to Christ, that the purifying blood is applied and the sins washed away. These three elements are: 1. Historical faith, or a belief on God and Christ as His Son and the Savior of sinners. 2. A confiding trust in Christ as a personal Savior. 3. A love for God as Father, and Christ as Savior, Master and King.

By this faith we lay hold on the promises of God, and when we first exercise it, the spirit of God makes new creatures of us. We are born again, begotten of God, regenerated. This agrees with the scriptures, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Baptism comes under the head of works. Could we save ourselves by baptism or works of any other nature, we could not lean on Christ for all, and would not have the humble spirit that should characterize all the followers of the meek and lowly Savior, but we would boast, "We saved ourselves."

"But baptism is a duty. It is commanded of us. Can ye be saved and disobey?" I maintain that if we were truly saved, we will endeavor and strive to obey all the commands of God, and it will be a source of joy to the soul to do so. Good works (including baptism) are the fruit and not the procuring cause of salvation.

DEAR BRO. JACKSON:—I am thankful that your heart has been touched by my needy condition, and your endeavor to "get one ray of light to penetrate" my "benighted" mind, though perhaps fruitless, was kind. But you have assigned another reason for replying to my article, which (and its author also I suppose) was unworthy of notice, and which could have no weight with the "intelligent and scripturally informed" readers of THE RECORD. You feared some "untaught," ignorant person might be infected by the hidden poison in my words.

Here comes in a singular coincidence. I wrote for precisely the same class that causes you such anxiety. I was not afraid that any "intelligent and scripturally informed" Baptist—especially if a RECORD reader, for THE RECORD is an additional safeguard—would be misled by the teaching of your preachers. But your denomination is making an aggressive warfare in this State, and while I console myself with the thought that Baptists seldom lose any timber that is worth having, still there are some "untaught," ignorant ones, babes in Christ, for whom I must fight as well as pray. So my article was not one of offense, but defense. I endeavored to defend and warn the "untaught," the novice both within and without the pale of my denomination. I expected a reply from Bro. W. A. Crum, the noted defender of the faith (never delivered to the saints, for whose zeal your State paper occasionally apologizes). But for some reason he has not delivered a reply, and I rejoice that my adversary is one of whom I have heard so much that is favorable as yourself. From what I know of you by reputation, as a meek and lowly Christian, I honor you, and as a brother in Christ you have my fraternal regards. So let us shake hands before we cross swords. I did not, and do not now, desire a controversy, and shall not endeavor to prolong it, though always ready to meet an attack. I assure you I shall not indulge in personalities, as I consider a resort to such weapons unworthy of one who claims to be born from above. I shall try to write in the spirit of my Master, and pray that no words of mine may wound a brother for whom Christ died.

If my reply seem unsatisfactory, let this be my excuse: I am too busy to exercise the caution of a revision, and so the first copy is the last. But the case with the article you assailed. If I seem to miss or evade any point, it is because in my haste it is overlooked. Should I be guilty of any apparent evasion, I would esteem it a favor if you would call my attention to it. You think me too ignorant to "set myself up" as a "writer for the public print." I admit I am not blessed with a college education, and have never had but fifteen months schooling in my life. What little knowledge I possess has been acquired by home reading and thinking. I endeavor to assimilate and absorb by meditation. The Bible I have read more than any book, and its pages never tire. The only books of a theological nature I have ever read are Christian's "Immersion" (one or two books in favor of baby sprinkling, and some books by Campbell, Ennet, Challen and other writers of your denomination. The only Baptist book I have ever read is your ultimate authority, the book from which all my theology is derived, the book that made a Baptist of me—the Bible. If I am admittedly so ignorant, why do I write? Because I believe in my soul that I am called of God to preach and defend His gospel, not only in the pulpit, but through the press and other lawful agencies. I write, and pray God to bless my work, and leave results with Him. You think me benighted. If so, pray for me, brother, and I shall continue to pray, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of this law."

But I must come to the point, or my creed will prove too lengthy for insertion. Allow me to say you have not met the issue I raised. I wished to know if the quotations from Prof. Lollars and Dr. Fagin did not teach baptismal regeneration; what they did teach? You have not answered this question, but simply endeavor (in vain, however), to prove that baptism is "the act on man's part that culminates in his salvation or pardon." I will pass by your illustrations, which do not illustrate, for you seem so conscious of the fact that they do not apply to the question in dispute that you anxiously inquire, "See the point?" As to the difference between the "Romish doctrine" of baptismal regeneration, and the teaching that baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins, little need be said by me, for Bro. Hackett has got in ahead of me, and in an excellent little paragraph says more than I could say in four columns. I have never said that the disciples taught that there was any saving efficacy in the water itself. I know very well that you claim that it is through the "obedience

of faith" that a man's sins are remitted in the act of baptism. My language in my former article—"the water, by absorption, reaches and cleanses the soul," must not be taken seriously—it was a rhetorical absurdity. I have never heard it claimed by any one that the water itself purified the soul, but all who teach this dogma of baptismal regeneration claim that, by virtue of God's appointment, or by virtue of the candidate's obedience, the sins are washed away in baptism. Your disposition is without a difference. If you teach that we are pardoned when baptized and not when we exercise faith, you magnify baptism, and consequently good works above faith, and undoubtedly teach baptismal regeneration, which you rightly call Romish doctrine.

If a man's sins are not forgiven until he is baptized, he is until then in an unsaved condition, and if he dies unbaptized, dies unsaved. Thus you make baptism essential to salvation, and make the "want of God, called to preach the word and baptize believers, more powerful than his Creator, in that he will not save a man who is not baptized." I will not endeavor to prove exhaustively that salvation is predicated of faith only, for I do not consider that I am called upon to do so, and were I so inclined, I would use more space than Bro. Hackett can spare me. However, I will touch briefly upon this subject. Paul repeatedly tells us that we are justified by faith without the works of the law. This faith, by which man attains unto salvation, is a comprehensive thing, for in it lies buried the germs of a new life, and consequently of new truths. God sees a man in his sinful and unsaved condition. His all-compassionate heart caused Him to give up His well-beloved Son to die, and the blood of the Lamb was freely shed for the salvation of the world. The spirit applies the gospel of truth to the heart of the sinner, and he awakens to a realization of his lost condition. What must he do? As he reflects upon his iniquity and the goodness of God, it leads him to repentance.

But repentance is not enough. Repentance consists of three elements: 1. A grievous consciousness of sin. 2. A Godly sorrow for sin. 3. A determined turning from sin. Repentance, then, evidently cannot save a sinner, for a knowledge of sin cannot begot holiness, a sorrow for sin cannot wash away its stain, and a turning from sin cannot make a new life, it cannot give the soul a love for good because it is good, nor can it fill the soul with spiritual aspirations. Man may stop here, and stop short of salvation. But the next step is faith, and the sinner, when he takes this step, is immediately saved for time and eternity. Why? By reason of divine appointment, and because faith, like repentance, consists of three elements: that bring the sinner into that relationship to Christ, that the purifying blood is applied and the sins washed away. These three elements are: 1. Historical faith, or a belief on God and Christ as His Son and the Savior of sinners. 2. A confiding trust in Christ as a personal Savior. 3. A love for God as Father, and Christ as Savior, Master and King.

By this faith we lay hold on the promises of God, and when we first exercise it, the spirit of God makes new creatures of us. We are born again, begotten of God, regenerated. This agrees with the scriptures, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Baptism comes under the head of works. Could we save ourselves by baptism or works of any other nature, we could not lean on Christ for all, and would not have the humble spirit that should characterize all the followers of the meek and lowly Savior, but we would boast, "We saved ourselves."

"But baptism is a duty. It is commanded of us. Can ye be saved and disobey?" I maintain that if we were truly saved, we will endeavor and strive to obey all the commands of God, and it will be a source of joy to the soul to do so. Good works (including baptism) are the fruit and not the procuring cause of salvation.

DEAR BRO. JACKSON:—I am thankful that your heart has been touched by my needy condition, and your endeavor to "get one ray of light to penetrate" my "benighted" mind, though perhaps fruitless, was kind. But you have assigned another reason for replying to my article, which (and its author also I suppose) was unworthy of notice, and which could have no weight with the "intelligent and scripturally informed" readers of THE RECORD. You feared some "untaught," ignorant person might be infected by the hidden poison in my words.

Here comes in a singular coincidence. I wrote for precisely the same class that causes you such anxiety. I was not afraid that any "intelligent and scripturally informed" Baptist—especially if a RECORD reader, for THE RECORD is an additional safeguard—would be misled by the teaching of your preachers. But your denomination is making an aggressive warfare in this State, and while I console myself with the thought that Baptists seldom lose any timber that is worth having, still there are some "untaught," ignorant ones, babes in Christ, for whom I must fight as well as pray. So my article was not one of offense, but defense. I endeavored to defend and warn the "untaught," the novice both within and without the pale of my denomination. I expected a reply from Bro. W. A. Crum, the noted defender of the faith (never delivered to the saints, for whose zeal your State paper occasionally apologizes). But for some reason he has not delivered a reply, and I rejoice that my adversary is one of whom I have heard so much that is favorable as yourself. From what I know of you by reputation, as a meek and lowly Christian, I honor you, and as a brother in Christ you have my fraternal regards. So let us shake hands before we cross swords. I did not, and do not now, desire a controversy, and shall not endeavor to prolong it, though always ready to meet an attack. I assure you I shall not indulge in personalities, as I consider a resort to such weapons unworthy of one who claims to be born from above. I shall try to write in the spirit of my Master, and pray that no words of mine may wound a brother for whom Christ died.

If my reply seem unsatisfactory, let this be my excuse: I am too busy to exercise the caution of a revision, and so the first copy is the last. But the case with the article you assailed. If I seem to miss or evade any point, it is because in my haste it is overlooked. Should I be guilty of any apparent evasion, I would esteem it a favor if you would call my attention to it. You think me too ignorant to "set myself up" as a "writer for the public print." I admit I am not blessed with a college education, and have never had but fifteen months schooling in my life. What little knowledge I possess has been acquired by home

WOMAN'S WORK

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

President—Mrs. Mary B. Aven Clinton.
Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer—Mrs. Rebecca P. Sprules Jackson.
Mrs. Minnie C. Cameron, Jackson, Miss.
OTHER MEMBERS.

Mrs. Addie M. Hillman, Clinton
Mrs. Sallie A. E. Baley, Jackson.
Mrs. Nannie L. Landers, Canton.
Mrs. Nellie D. Deupree, Clinton.
Mrs. Annie Tillman Owens, Crystal Springs.
VICE PRESIDENTS OF ASSOCIATIONS.
Lebanon (new)—Mrs. E. V. Clark, Ellettsville, Miss.
Abertown—Mrs. Sallie J. Stewart, Red Land.
Bogue Chitto—Mrs. Emma A. Porter, Mr. Herman, La.
Calhoun—Mrs. Edna F. Bruner, Banner.
Carry—Miss Louella D. Clough, Natchez.
Central—Mrs. Margaret J. Webb, Clinton.
Chester—Miss Mary Carter.

Chickasaw—Mrs. Georgia Dees Phillips, Shubuta.
Chickasaw—Mrs. Sallie J. Leavelle, Cherry Creek.
Coldwater—Miss Elizabeth Lea Mabry, Senatobia.
Columbus—Mrs. Julia Toke Johnson, Columbus.
Dear Creek—Mrs. George Carothers, Indianola.
Fair River—Mrs. Mattie A. Green, Brookhaven.
Gulf Coast—Mrs. Sue W. Price Ocean Springs.
Harmony—Mrs. L. Geneva Wilbanks, Carthage.
Judson—Mrs. Sallie E. Ballard, Ballardville.
Kosciusko—Mrs. May Sallis Boyett, Sallis.
Louisville—Mrs. Mary Ella Williams, Louisville.
Mississippi—Mrs. Abbie Sibley, Summit.
Mississippi River—Mrs. Bettie Powell, Gillsburg.
Oxford—Mrs. Lizzie Leavelle, Oxford.
Pearl River—Mrs. Jennie Cowser Williams, Stix.
Pearl River—Mrs. M. M. Griffith Silver Creek.
Springfield—Mrs. C. J. Lowrey Forest.

Copiah—Miss Adella Martin, Hazlehurst.
Strong River—Mrs. Maud Didlake, Steen's Creek.
Sunderland—Mrs. Lou E. Bobo, Lyon.
Tippah—Mrs. Angie Slack McMillan, Blue Mountain.
Tlalomingo—Mrs. Annie L. Swain, Rienzi.
Tombigbee—Mrs. Susan Chastain, Rara Avis.
Union—Mrs. Neppie O. Thompson, Bodney.
West Judson—Mrs. Mary Reed Pegues, Tupelo.
Yalobusha—Mrs. Leone Woolark, Jefferson.
Yazoo—Mrs. Alice Booth Drain, Winona.

Zion—Mrs. Alma Arnold, Walhalla.
Rankin County Association—Mrs. J. M. Palmer.
OBJECTS OF BENEVOLENCE.

Foreign Missions, Home Missions, State Missions, Ministerial Education, Mississippi College, Sustentation of Aged Ministers Home Uses.

PRICES

CREAM BAKING POWDER

MOST PERFECT MADE

A pure Grape Cream of Tartar Powder. Free from Ammonia, Alum or any other adulterant. 40 YEARS THE STANDARD.

Union and the ladies of the various churches. There were four delegates and a vice-president from each of the fourteen States, North Carolina and Arkansas each being divided into two jurisdictions. Fully 1,000 people were assembled in the Sunday School house, where every arrangement had been made by the ladies of the Washington Baptist churches. There were devotional exercises before the meeting, the main feature of which was a solo by Mrs. J. D. Smith, of Washington, and were followed by the accustomed address of welcome, which was delivered by Mrs. C. A. Stakely, of Washington, and was responded to by Mrs. J. C. Porter, of Florida.

The morning was largely devoted to the transaction of routine business. Committees were appointed on credentials, resolutions, nominations and obituaries, and the annual reports of officers were received. The address of the president of the union, Mrs. A. M. Gwathmey, was interesting, reviewing in a general way the year's work and encouraging the society to greater exertions in the coming season. The most important report aside from that of the treasurer, was that of Miss Annie W. Armstrong, the corresponding secretary. In the course of her report, she said: "In this season of varied distress many of the missionaries have testified that the boxes of supplies sent to them by the union have been their only means of support. This year credits the largest number of boxes—224 sent out, valued at \$12,874. The boxes vary greatly in value, ranging from \$5 to \$250, but an effort is made to distribute them where they will do the most good, and some of the responses received from the workers in the field, is touching in the extreme. The work of the society in Cuba exhibited many features of interest. Missionary work among the colored people of the South was commented upon as one of the most important missionary undertakings that had been engaged in by the society. These and many other branches of home work was touched upon, while the next meeting was devoted to the work of the foreign fields. There was an address by Dr. R. J. Williamson on the success of the mission work and a general discussion limited to three minutes each among the members of the society. The recommendations reported by the foreign board were as follows:

1. For the Christmas offering of 1895 we recommend the further extension of the work in the great empire of China, which during this year, God has opened up as never before.

2. That the sisters in their missionary societies endeavor to raise, during the year, \$30,000 in aid of foreign missions, this sum to include the results of all special efforts, such as Christmas offerings, etc.

3. That the Woman's Missionary Union be requested, in connection with the Sunday School Board, which has this work in charge, to lend their valuable aid toward making a grand success of a "Missionary Day" in our Sunday Schools.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION.
The second session was held Saturday, consecration services being led by Mrs. J. S. Barnham, of Baltimore. State reports were given by:

Miss Payne, South Carolina, Mrs. Ramsey, and Miss Emma Heck, of North Carolina, spoke most interestingly and practically on the subject of Central Committees. "Country societies" were represented by Mrs. F. E. Woodson, of Arkansas, who spoke on "Heart to Heart Work," systematized. Mrs. R. P. Johnson, of Missouri, spoke on "City Societies," and Mrs. Burnham, of Missouri, then spoke of the interest of the union, reporting for that State in a characteristic, lively and earnest style. Mississippi was then heard from, Miss Sproule's report being read by Mrs. Kimbrough. Mrs. James Pollard then reported from Maryland. Dr. Tichenor next addressed the ladies, introducing Dr. Diaz, a distinguished missionary worker in Cuba, who has only lately learned English. Dr. J. R. Payne, formerly of Boston, now of Cuba, was then introduced and gave a resume of the progress of the mission in the island. A Chinese brother, Don Shing Moy, was then presented, and in a pathetically broken English, told a story of conversion and how "wolly much" the Bible had helped, declaring "no more idol for me."

In Poor Health

means so much more than you imagine—serious and fatal diseases result from trifling ailments neglected. Don't play with Nature's greatest gift—health.

Brown's Iron Bitters

It cures Dyspepsia, Kidney and Liver Troubles, Constipation, Red Blood, Malaria, Nervous ailments, Women's complaints.

Lines on the wrapper. All druggists and grocers sell it. On receipt of ten cents, send for a free trial bottle. BROWN CHEMICAL CO., BALTIMORE, MD.

FREE TUITION AND BOARD GIVEN IN THE LEADING SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

R. H. Woodward Company, Baltimore, Md., are offering \$900 to any agent selling 200 copies of "Talks to Children about Jesus" in three months. Agents often sell from 10 to 15 copies per day of this beautiful and low priced book. Freight is paid and credit given on books. Send them at once 35 cts. for complete canvassing outfit and full information. They offer, in addition to the sum of \$200, very liberal inducements which will enable any energetic person to make enough to pay tuition and board in any of the leading schools or colleges.

ANNIVERSARY WEEK.
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK, MAY 27-JUNE 3, 1895.

Monday, May 27—Meeting of the Woman's Baptist Home Mission Society.
Baptist Young People's Union Meeting—Every day at 8:30 a. m.
American Baptist Missionary Union, eighty-third anniversary—May 28 and 29.
American Baptist Home Mission Society, sixty-third anniversary—May 30 and 31.
American Baptist Publication Society, seventy-first anniversary—June 1 and 2.

HOW'S THIS!
We offer One Hundred Dollars Reward for any case of Catarrh that cannot be cured by Hall's Catarrh Cure.
F. J. Cheney & Co., Props. Toledo, O.
We, the undersigned, have known F. J. Cheney for the last 15 years, and believe him perfectly honorable in all business transactions and financially able to carry out all obligations made by him. WEST & TRUAX, Wholesale Druggists, Toledo, O.
WALDING & KINMAN, Wholesale Druggists, Toledo, O.
Hall's Catarrh Cure is taken internally, acting directly upon the blood and mucous surfaces of the system. Price 75c. per bottle. Sold by all druggists. Testimonials free.

EPWORTH LEAGUES!
Send stamp for official book "Historic Chattanooga," containing full particulars. International Convention of Epworth Leagues, at Chattanooga next June. The Queen and Crescent route will make rate one fare for round trip.
A. J. LITTLE, D. P. A., Chattanooga, Tenn.
J. R. McCREGG, T. P. A., Birmingham, Ala.
O. L. MITCHELL, T. P. A., Knoxville, Tenn.
T. M. HUNT, T. P. A., Dallas, Texas.
I. HARDY, A. G. P. A., Vicksburg, Miss.
R. H. GARRATT, A. G. P. A., New Orleans.
W. C. RINEARSON, G. P. A., Cincinnati, O.

LUKA SPRINGS.
In arranging to spend the summer at a pleasant resort, the pleasure-seeker looks to three things only: Where is the most convenient place to inhale pure air, surrounded by beautiful and attractive scenery, and having immunity from exorbitant charges? Now, stranger, come to Luka Springs one summer, and see if you do not meet all your requirements—and even more.

Hotels, cottages and boarding houses are in Luka, and the summer is the best time to visit.

The delightful situation of Luka Springs is at once observed by all visitors. Nature has done no more for any place on the globe to mark its peculiar fitness as the spot for a health resort.

To reach this famous place, which is towering among the grand and uplifting scenery of the Southland, where even an anchorite might draw inspiration and drink in love of living, you have to travel the short distance of only one hundred and fifteen miles east from Memphis, Tenn., on the Memphis and Charleston Railroad.

No health resort in the world possesses a finer climate; the air is pure and bracing, and not of a damp and depressing effect, but gives new life, new inspiration, and causes the invalid and the worn-out business man to enter on a new existence, as it were, and throw off the dull care of the past.

Luka Springs is adapted to most all diseases, being so arranged by nature as to give treatment to different forms of disease from different springs, all in the same cluster. It is not an exaggeration to say that nature has freely blessed Luka and the surrounding country with wild, rugged scenery, in majestic grandeur, which words are inadequate to describe.

CANCER.

FOR A GOOD HARVEST

GREGORY'S SEEDS

THE GENUINE JACKSON CORSET WAIST STANDS AT THE FRONT.

Easy-fitting, yet giving complete support to the form. It is well made of good material and fast colors. We ask you to try it.

Made Only by the JACKSON CORSET CO., Jackson, Mich.

CARRIAGES, BUGGIES, HARNESS

POZZONI'S POWDER

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

FOR A GOOD HARVEST

GREGORY'S SEEDS

THE GENUINE JACKSON CORSET WAIST STANDS AT THE FRONT.

Easy-fitting, yet giving complete support to the form. It is well made of good material and fast colors. We ask you to try it.

Made Only by the JACKSON CORSET CO., Jackson, Mich.

CARRIAGES, BUGGIES, HARNESS

POZZONI'S POWDER

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

FOR A GOOD HARVEST

GREGORY'S SEEDS

THE GENUINE JACKSON CORSET WAIST STANDS AT THE FRONT.

Easy-fitting, yet giving complete support to the form. It is well made of good material and fast colors. We ask you to try it.

Made Only by the JACKSON CORSET CO., Jackson, Mich.

CARRIAGES, BUGGIES, HARNESS

POZZONI'S POWDER

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

POZZONI'S

IT IS WELL KNOWN

PERIODICALS

unsurpassed in mechanical excellence, artistic appearance, and literary merit. Its contributors are the leading men in the denomination.

The best of it is the Society does not live backward, but that it continues to advance and improve the old customs.

Club prices of five or more copies to one address.

BAPTIST SUPERINTENDENT, 61 cts. per quarter; 25 cts. per year. BAPTIST TEACHER, 12 cts. per quarter; 50 cts. per year.

INTERNATIONAL SERIES. ADVANCED QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. INTERMEDIATE QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. BIBLE LESSONS, 11 cts. per year.

INDUCTIVE SERIES. JUNIOR INDUCTIVE STUDIES, 25 cts. per year. NEW PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. TWO YEARS WITH JESUS, 25 cts. per year. PICTURE AND QUESTION, 4 cts. per year.

ILLUSTRATED PAPERS. OUR YOUNG PEOPLE, 10 cts. per year. YOUNG READER, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. SUNLIGHT, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. OUR LITTLE ONES, 6 cts. per year.

BIBLE LESSON PICTURES, \$1.00. FOR THE CHURCH AND FAMILY. THE COLPORTER, 5 cents per year, in clubs of 20 or more.

SAMPLES FREE.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

STONE; COLLEGE; FOR; YOUNG; LADIES

Do You Know How To

Buy your tickets over the

LOUISVILLE and Nashville R. R.

2 ROUTES EAST

ONLY LINE WITH Double Daily Trains

New Orleans & Memphis.

Providing sure connections from start to destination.

IT IS WELL KNOWN

PERIODICALS

unsurpassed in mechanical excellence, artistic appearance, and literary merit. Its contributors are the leading men in the denomination.

The best of it is the Society does not live backward, but that it continues to advance and improve the old customs.

Club prices of five or more copies to one address.

BAPTIST SUPERINTENDENT, 61 cts. per quarter; 25 cts. per year. BAPTIST TEACHER, 12 cts. per quarter; 50 cts. per year.

INTERNATIONAL SERIES. ADVANCED QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. INTERMEDIATE QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. BIBLE LESSONS, 11 cts. per year.

INDUCTIVE SERIES. JUNIOR INDUCTIVE STUDIES, 25 cts. per year. NEW PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. TWO YEARS WITH JESUS, 25 cts. per year. PICTURE AND QUESTION, 4 cts. per year.

ILLUSTRATED PAPERS. OUR YOUNG PEOPLE, 10 cts. per year. YOUNG READER, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. SUNLIGHT, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. OUR LITTLE ONES, 6 cts. per year.

BIBLE LESSON PICTURES, \$1.00. FOR THE CHURCH AND FAMILY. THE COLPORTER, 5 cents per year, in clubs of 20 or more.

SAMPLES FREE.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

STONE; COLLEGE; FOR; YOUNG; LADIES

Do You Know How To

Buy your tickets over the

LOUISVILLE and Nashville R. R.

2 ROUTES EAST

ONLY LINE WITH Double Daily Trains

New Orleans & Memphis.

Providing sure connections from start to destination.

IT IS WELL KNOWN

PERIODICALS

unsurpassed in mechanical excellence, artistic appearance, and literary merit. Its contributors are the leading men in the denomination.

The best of it is the Society does not live backward, but that it continues to advance and improve the old customs.

Club prices of five or more copies to one address.

BAPTIST SUPERINTENDENT, 61 cts. per quarter; 25 cts. per year. BAPTIST TEACHER, 12 cts. per quarter; 50 cts. per year.

INTERNATIONAL SERIES. ADVANCED QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. INTERMEDIATE QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. BIBLE LESSONS, 11 cts. per year.

INDUCTIVE SERIES. JUNIOR INDUCTIVE STUDIES, 25 cts. per year. NEW PRIMARY QUARTERLY, 25 cts. per year. TWO YEARS WITH JESUS, 25 cts. per year. PICTURE AND QUESTION, 4 cts. per year.

ILLUSTRATED PAPERS. OUR YOUNG PEOPLE, 10 cts. per year. YOUNG READER, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. SUNLIGHT, MONTHLY, 5 cts. per year. OUR LITTLE ONES, 6 cts. per year.

BIBLE LESSON PICTURES, \$1.00. FOR THE CHURCH AND FAMILY. THE COLPORTER, 5 cents per year, in clubs of 20 or more.

SAMPLES FREE.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

STONE; COLLEGE; FOR; YOUNG; LADIES

Do You Know How To

Buy your tickets over the

LOUISVILLE and Nashville R. R.

2 ROUTES EAST

ONLY LINE WITH Double Daily Trains

New Orleans & Memphis.

Providing sure connections from start to destination.

